

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-14 are pending in this application, of which claim 2 has been amended. No new claims have been added.

In the Office Action dated **November 1, 2004**, were rejected as follows:

1. Claims 2-5, 8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Shields** in view of JP Publication 3-159500 to Katsumi et al. (hereinafter "**JP '500**");
2. Claim 6 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Shields** in view of U.S. Patent 5,579,396 to Iida et al. (hereinafter "**Iida et al.**");
3. Claim 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Shields** in view of **Iida et al.**;
4. Claims 9-11 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Shields** in view of JP Publication 61-61598 to Haruo (hereinafter "**JP '598**");
5. Claim 12 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Shields** in view of U.S. Patent 5,521,765 to Wolfe (hereinafter "**Wolfe**"); and
6. Claim 13 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Shields** in view of JP Publication 9-212270 to Hornsari et al. (hereinafter "**JP '270**").

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Although **Shields** and **JP '500** teach controlling a sound image position by phasing (synchronization) using delay elements, this results in only increasing a sound pressure in a specific

**Preliminary Amendment filed February 25, 2005  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/801,897**

direction or at a specific position and does not result in cancellation of interference between the individual transducers at signal control points, as in the present invention. Thus, none of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggests outputting a signal at the signal control point corresponding to the respective transducers or a sound interference canceling signal component for canceling an interference with the transducer serving as the other signal control points, as recited in claims 2 and 14 of the instant application, where claims 3-13 depend from claim 2.

Accordingly, claim 2 has been amended to clarify that the interference is cancelled between the individual transducers "at the signal control point".

Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The claims are now in condition for further examination.

In the event that any fees are due in connection with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,  
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

*William L. Brooks*

William L. Brooks  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/plb  
Atty. Docket No. **010280**  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 659-2930



**23850**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE